

infringing them, but the President in the field at the head of his army, can prescribe the terms upon which he shall reign master, so far that it will puzzle any American ever to get his neck from under the galling yoke. I cannot with patience think of this idea. If ever he violates the laws, one of two things will happen: he will come at the head of his army to carry everything before him, or he will give bail, or do what Mr. Chief Justice will order him. If he be guilty, will not the recollection of his crimes teach him to make one bold push for the American throne? Will not the immense difference between being master of everything, and being ignominiously tried and punished, powerfully excite him to make this bold push? But, sir, where is the existing force to punish him? Can he not, at the head of his army, beat down every opposition? Away with your President, we shall have a King; the army will salute him monarch; your militia will leave you, and assist in making him king, and fight against you; and what have you to oppose this force? what will then become of you and your rights? Will not absolute despotism ensue?"

Let me ask gentlemen who favor a consolidated government, how they like this picture that Patrick Henry has drawn of their idol.

The hammer again fell.

Mr. DANIEL. Some three years ago in the city of Baltimore we were tauntingly told that we had no government. And when the streets bristled with cannon charged to the mouth with grape and canister, and armed men were rushing to and fro in the streets, usurping the military authority, when the old flag of the Union was torn down and the flag that represents the States' Rights Sovereignty, the flag of Maryland, was put up in its place; aye, sir, when even ladies—those who called themselves ladies—were rushing through the streets with secession badges flaunting and with pistols by their sides, and when it was almost as much as a man's life was worth to mention the Union; then we did gravely begin to think that we had no government. Men began to look each other in the face, inquiring, Has the old government clean gone forever?

I thought, sir, that those days had passed by. I thought the recent developments, from that time to the present, had shown everybody that we had a government, not only able to control individual citizens, but able to control the State. Where should we have been today if it had not been for the power of the central government, whose soldiers, the nation's defenders, rushed from every State of the Union into the State of Maryland at the call of the National Government, and saved Maryland to the Union. I thought such information had reached even the county of Prince George's, and the county of Anne Arundel, that the government had such a

power, and were exercising that power. But it seems that I have been somewhat mistaken, for in listening to the debates which we have heard here for the last few days, one would think we were away back in the old days of the Confederation; that for the first time this question of State and National sovereignty was about being discussed, and upon the formation of a National Constitution we were about to decide whether we should have a National Government with strong powers, or should have the State sovereignties which existed under the old Confederation. Or we might almost suppose from the earnestness with which gentlemen promulgate their theories here, that they were for the first time announcing some new theory of government and political science. We might not go quite so far back as the days of the Confederation; but we might imagine that we were in the Senate of the United States listening to the celebrated Calhoun, who was the author and expounder of these doctrines, or some of his school from that time down to the time of Benjamin, the apostate Jew.

I had thought that with the American people such doctrines were exploded, or if they had not been exploded already by the crushing logic of Webster, the keen analysis of Clay, and the sturdy good sense and determined will of Jackson, who would have hung the author as high as Haman if he had persisted in it, that powder and ball was exploding them, and that General Grant was on the mission now, and we should soon hear no more of States' rights doctrines. They have appealed to the arbitrament of the sword to settle this question. After trying thirty years or more out of Congress and in Congress to impress these ideas upon the people, and finding it all in vain, they appeal to an arbitrament of these dreadful political heresies that is deluging the country in blood.

The gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Belt,) told us of the great peace and prosperity under the administration of this States' rights party, the Democratic party. I deny it, sir, and I say that if the States' Rights Democratic party had had their way the country would have been ruined long ago. Come back with me to the time of Calhoun. Suppose he had had his way when South Carolina first raised this doctrine, where should we have been? South Carolina would have annulled the law of the government laying an impost duty; and another State might have annulled another law for another reason, and another State still another law; and where should we have been? We should have found the remaining States saying they did not agree to any such doctrine. Maryland or Pennsylvania, for instance, might say, We waived the right to lay imposts in our harbors in order that the general government might lay them equally upon all the